

SECRET

OXC-2076
Copy 8 of 8

10 August 1961

MEMORANDUM FOR : Chief, Materiel Staff, Development Projects Division

SUBJECT : Planning for Support Aircraft in OXCANT []

1. I thought you might be interested in the figures which Colonel Geary was quoting at large during our visit [] last week as a helpful assist in planning for the whole spectrum of problems associated with the presence of numerous support aircraft in the Area.

2. Colonel Geary's figures as to numbers of aircraft to be positioned [] are as follows:

- 4 F-101's (possible RF versions)
- 1 F-104C (chase plane)
- 1 C-47
- 1 U-3A
- 2 T-33's
- 1 C-130 (required for engine and parts airlift)

3. It is my understanding, based on Colonel Geary's remarks [] when I brought the subject up, that no attempt will be made to provide a depot level maintenance capability for any of the above aircraft. I had raised this question in terms of what appeared to me to be insufficient warehousing space to accommodate the tremendous number of line items I associate with the number and variety of aircraft. Colonel Geary expressed a preference in the case of F-101's, for example, of providing say two sixty-day fly-away kits for the four aircraft, with the understanding that no attempt would be made [] to stock any parts beyond the FAK level. I might mention here as well that [] has no capability to support the F-101 according to []

4. Kelly Johnson says that he will support the F-104C from his own manpower resources. By contrast Colonel Geary estimates that support for the F-101's will require the addition of 17 military slots. I assume this is on the basis of three or four man crews plus supervisory overhead. Kelly

SECRET

SECRET

OXC-2076
Page 2

indicated that he would require Colonel Geary's assistance in obtaining from Air Force parts as required to maintain the F-104, but in the case of depot level maintenance as in the instance of the F-101's, it was clearly implied that this work would be done elsewhere, presumably [REDACTED]

25X1A

5. As I see it, at this time we now have what amounts to a formal requirement for at least seven high performance jets utilizing JP-4 fuel, as well as a C-130 employing the same fuel. In light of this I wonder if our fuel storage capability for JP-4 [REDACTED] is adequate. I have no idea of the fuel consumption on the 101's or the 130's, but with the frequency of flights I can imagine. Since the 101 is to be used as a training aircraft, do you feel that we now have adequate storage capability for JP-4? Perhaps we should kick this subject around before it is too late to put forth a change order on our required tankage. In this connection I also wonder if anyone is giving thought to the special fuel tanks which will be required, I assume, at those bases where the KC-135's operate in support of the A-12. If the Air Force has as much trouble with stainless steel tanks as we seem to have had, starting today to be concerned about the problem is barely early enough. You may have already mentioned this to Colonel Geary, however. I gather that you will be taking into account the above number of aircraft in the course of figuring the proper dimensions and thickness of the concrete pad required for the support aircraft parking area. I have no idea of what the comparative wheel loadings of these aircraft are, but I assume you are taking steps to secure this information in conjunction with [REDACTED]

SIGNED

JAMES A. CUNNINGHAM, JR.
Acting Chief, DPD-DD/P

Distribution:

- 1 - DPD/MAT
- 2 - ASST CH/DPD
- 3 - AC/DPD
- 4 - DPD/SPB
- 5 - DPD/ADMIN
- 6 - DPD/SG
- 7 - C/DPD/DB
- 8 - DPD/RI

DPD-DD/P: JACunningham, Jr./mg

RECEIVED
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

25X1A